



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in men dates from nothing previous, other things date from it, rather."

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

THE PLACE OF LEISURE IN LIFE.*

B. BOSANQUET.

I PROPOSE to throw my remarks into a form which may not quite correspond with what was expected from my choice of a subject. But I do believe my treatment will touch the essence of the matter, and it will attempt to bring home to us the inner meaning of a great book, to which it seems to me that even expert scholars hardly as a rule do justice.

I want, then, to lay before you a popular account of the unity, or what I love to call the plot, of Aristotle's "Ethics"; the great work in which he studied, not individual morality as contrasted with politics,—but the nature of the true aim of life for man, as contrasted with the methods of statesmanship, by which it might be impressed upon and embodied in the civic organism. To me the subject is fascinating. The gradual development of the great teacher's thought, the depth of meaning which reveals itself in formulæ which taken unintelligently by themselves seem the very type of abstractions and emptiness, and are so considered by critics of repute,—all this is to me a never-ceasing delight. Whether I can in any degree impart my feeling of the matter remains to be seen. Of course, I omit technicality and tell you things as I understand them. I owe my leading conception to Professor Burnet's edition of the "Ethics" and certain points also to that of Professor Stewart; and the former has himself stated an idea of the same type in his book on "Aristotle's Theory of Education."

* An address to the Cardiff Educational Society.

1. Every soul of every creature, such is Aristotle's starting point, has a form, or possible perfection, which the universe is striving in it to bring to completion through its life.

In the human soul every stage toward this completion may be called an excellence or virtue; and of these excellences or virtues there are two general divisions. There are first the excellences of man's compound nature, in which feeling and desire are learning submission to the law of reason. These he calls the 'ethical' virtues; a term which we, somewhat unfortunately, have taken up and rendered as if equivalent to all that we understand by moral excellence. They derive their name, for him, from their connection with habit; they are qualities or rather attitudes of soul which we acquire in society, and in the main through assimilating the social tradition. Temperance, courage, gentleness, generosity, with many like them, are Aristotle's excellences of man's compound nature, or excellences of habituation, *ethical* excellences.

The other set of excellences are the excellences of the intellectual part, the so-called intellectual virtues. But I will say at once that we commit a mere misconstruction if we take them to be excellences of intellectual capacity; as we might say, memory, or mathematical talent, or the power of learning languages. The dominant ones at least are nothing of this kind; they are clearly, as we shall see, the excellences of good life and habit, exalted, reinforced and reinterpreted by passing into the region of principle and of great ideas. Intelligence is not an exclusive part, but is the form of the whole.

Now let us begin to sketch the nature of a single act of duty, as Aristotle conceives it, and trace from that point the expansion of the moral horizon, till time and place fall away or rather are rounded into a whole and morality passes into religion.

2. The simplest moral duty has for Aristotle a double aspect. The motive of the citizen who gives his life for his country, for example, is described in a curious two-

fold language, the significance of which is not difficult to see. He does the act of duty for its own sake. There is in it something absolute. If it were done for the sake of something beyond, of praise or gain, it would no longer be the act it seemed to be. This we can see at once. But again; this and every act of duty is performed for the sake of the beautiful,—for in all virtue this is the motive. And here again we have no doubt what is meant. The duty is done for its own sake, for the sake of what it is. But the conception of what it is is capable of expansion. “For the sake of the beautiful”—a widening horizon is set before us by this description of the moral motive. What is the moral beautiful? If we fully understood the simplest act of duty, what is it that according to Aristotle we should see there?

Let me illustrate further by the famous doctrine of the mean, the definition of an ethical excellence. An ethical virtue or excellence of man’s compound nature is an attitude of will, “being in a relative mean defined by a ratio, and by whatever the man of practical wisdom would define it by.”

I will not trouble you with negative criticism, I shall say at once what I think it signifies, having just pointed out that once more it refers us to something on ahead,—to the man of practical wisdom.

We must have observed in any such form of conduct as an act of beneficence, or munificence, how infallibly the churl in spirit betrays himself, to use Aristotle’s phrase, in the quantity or degree or time or place or manner or personal relations of his action. Only the true motive gives you the perfect act. The brave man again; how hard it is to be brave, and gentle, and modest, and calm, and wise. The brave and noble soul, and it alone, will ring true in every side and aspect of its act; time, place, manner, degree, behavior to persons; all the characters which make up an act whose quality takes form in quantity, and is adapted to the situation with a beautiful adequateness, in every detail just right, neither

too little nor yet too much, like the petals of a rose. Such an action is a manifestation of an excellence, a soul rightly tempered and attuned, a disposition or attitude of mind that is the 'mean' or adjusted condition relative to or demanded by the situation.

So far, then, the horizon has expanded. The excellent action, done for its own sake, which is for the sake of the beautiful, is now understood to be an act expressive of a state of soul rightly attuned so that in every detail and quantitative particular its utterance hits what is appropriate and adequate.

But there is something more; this temper or attitude does not explain itself, and the phrase which described it, at the same moment beckoned us forward to a further standard. The mean adjustment or ratio which was the characteristic of the excellent attitude of soul was not yet, we saw, thoroughly defined. It is an adjustment to circumstances; but an adjustment in the interests of what? The answer was given by a reference to something not yet stated. The mean is determined by a further standard; and the standard is the right ratio, and whatever the man of practical wisdom would determine.

3. This is a reference forward from the first half of the treatise to the second half. Let us recapitulate. Every act of the compound nature of man,—his combined reason and desire,—which is excellent, or an act of virtue, is done, we saw, at once for its own sake, and for the sake of the beautiful. That is to say, its own nature, being more fully understood, is one with the nature of the beautiful. Wishing to know to what this points us forward, we found that such an act, as an expression of virtue, is something perfectly adequate and adjusted to the situation, right in every particular, in every detail. If the motive or attitude of soul were in any way wrong or imperfect, the act would betray it at once by passing over into exaggeration or deficiency at some one of its innumerable aspects and peculiarities. What should be courage, for example, would be vulgar or ostentatious,

or rash, or false, or wanting to itself in resolution or in tranquillity or in gentleness.

The churl in spirit, howe'er he veil
His want in forms for fashion's sake,
Will let his coltish nature break
At seasons through the gilded pale,
For who can always act?

We can understand that a moral perfection which results in a reliably perfect expression may be called beautiful, but still we have not learned in the interest of what central principle our adjustments are to be determined, and we have been referred to something that lies ahead.

The standard, we are told, lies in what is determined by the man of practical wisdom. What is practical wisdom, and where does it obtain its standard?

We said that besides the excellences of man's compound nature, Aristotle ascribes to him what he calls the intellectual excellences; not, we said, such capacities as memory, or scientific acumen, or creative genius, but rather the content of good life, when raised to a level of principle and systematic insight, as opposed to mere habituation and customary self-control.

According to Aristotle, the two intellectual excellences are practical and theoretical wisdom. About theoretical wisdom we will speak later. It is practical wisdom to which we have been referred; and which, in approaching its discussion, Aristotle implies to possess "the standard of the means or adjustments."

Practical wisdom for Aristotle is one with something which is present in all the animal creation and different for every kind of creature. It is the group-instinct, or the group-intelligence, or the consciousness of kind. In humanity it is the statesman's knowledge and perception; the gift and ability of the man who, having trained insight into the distinctively human good or evil of life, based on his own excellence of character in which it is up to a certain point realized, is able to guide the organization, habituation and education of the group (for the

statesman's business is more especially education) in the direction which will lead them to it.

But here once more the horizon expands. The statesman knows what is the end of human life, and has skill and insight to govern society and direct the educational habituation which instills the ethical or current social virtues in the right direction and to the right adjustments and adaptations—the ratios or means in conduct.

But still our quest is not ended. *What* is the end of human life in view of which the statesman organizes both politics and education? The answer is to be found in the relation of practical wisdom to theoretical wisdom. Practical wisdom, we have seen, is different for every organic group, and in a measure may be said to be distributed throughout creation. Theoretical wisdom is always one and the same, and strictly speaking, it is divine; it studies no production of instruments for the good of mankind; it cannot strictly be said to aim at the special good of mankind; it does not specially concern itself with man, or at all with one group of creatures rather than with another. Its object of study or contemplation is rather what is above and beyond man; there are many things in the universe more divine than man, Aristotle emphatically observes; more especially, it occupies itself with the nature of God. But though it is not an *efficient* cause of attaining the end of man, the name for which in Aristotle is happiness, it is the formal cause, or at least a part of the formal cause; that is to say, it does not produce human happiness as a cause may produce an effect other than itself; but it *is* human happiness or the end of man, or at least a considerable constituent of that end.

Now the precise relation of practical to theoretical wisdom according to Aristotle is an interesting point. Practical wisdom, we said, is the wisdom of the statesman, and so far must be assumed to be supreme in society. On the other hand, theoretical wisdom is the higher activity, and is identical, or identical so far as human nature can attain it, with that activity of the soul which is hap-

piness and the end of human life. Now how can the lower activity of practical wisdom be supreme over the higher, which is theoretical wisdom? Which of the two is really superior and the guide of life? Aristotle puts the contradiction plainly, and his answer is clear. Practical wisdom rules society in the interests of theoretical wisdom, but does not rule over theoretical wisdom itself. Expanding the answer, a follower of Aristotle compares the statesman's art to the house-steward or head of the servants, and theoretical wisdom to the master of the house. The house-steward rules the house with a view to the master's leisure, his *σχολή*. The master has his duties of magistrate or thinker or soldier to perform; the household is organized to give him leisure for them. Just such is the statesman's duty, let us say, toward art, or the life of thought or religion.

The relation is expanded by an Aristotelian writer: "So whatever choice or distribution of worldly resources, whether of bodily qualities or of wealth or of friends or of other goods, will be most helpful toward the contemplation of God, that is the best, and that is the most beautiful standard or organization; and whatever arrangement, whether by defect or by excess, hinders men from glorifying God and enjoying him, that arrangement is bad." (Stewart, II, 4, E. E. *θ.*, 3, 1249 a21-b25.) The final standard of the means or adjustments of conduct, then, is the highest life of the soul. The habituation of the young and the moral education of society are to be so guided and framed by the statesman that art and learning and religion shall always hold the highest place and so far as humanly possible shall have the lead in, and form the inspiration of, his country. The simplest act of duty, we may say, in its twofold scope, points forward to the knowledge of God. The act of duty, we saw, in being for its own sake, is for the sake of the beautiful; and in being for the sake of the beautiful it is a perfecting of the soul by a fine and delicate adjustment and adaptation to the social order; and further, in being an

adaptation to the social order, it is finally instrumental to that which inspires and justifies and resumes the meaning of the social order, namely, to the activity in which the soul finds its perfection in laying hold of the divine. You do not, in the view of Plato and Aristotle, in aspiring to intellectual excellence and to religious contemplation, tread a separate and diverging path from that of the ordinary good citizen. You follow his path, but pursue it further, and what the saint or the poet or the thinker may attain at the end is only the quintessence of what all of you have been practicing from the beginning.

4. The true relation of theoretical wisdom to moral development receives a remarkable illumination from the theory of friendship, which shows how practical wisdom must in its highest form actually pass into that which is theoretical.

Practical wisdom, we saw, is the human form of the group instinct or consciousness of kind. In Aristotle's view there is, all through creation, a certain feeling of affection corresponding to every form of this consciousness of kind. He illustrates it by the different levels of parental care which attend upon the different levels of intelligence in the animal world. This is so in man as in other species. Every form of human association has its characteristic type of group-sentiment or liking, or 'friendship,' as he terms it, corresponding to the form of group-intelligence which it implies.

This being so, you have only to consider the case of the highest form of human association to see how the group-intelligence or sense of group—welfare (practical wisdom) must transform itself into theoretical wisdom. For the highest form of human association is that in which human beings have come to care for that in each other which is the best and consequently the most real thing in them, namely, the highest goodness and intelligence. When this is so, the group-consciousness has become the consciousness of a response in the other person to what is highest and best in the self. This response

is a heightening of life, by the extension of the awareness of our life to the life of the friend who shares our consciousness of the best things. We feel our life intensified in his. Therefore the consciousness which we share with him is *ipso facto* the consciousness of the highest activity of the soul. Any other common consciousness would be comparatively external and accidental, and would not give us the same community of feeling.

Therefore practical wisdom or the instinct toward group-welfare, not only, in directing human society, aims at adjusting it to the presence of the highest activities; but, in so far as men become all they might become, actually passes into those activities.

Thus we have followed the expanding horizon of the great moralist's account of the end of human life, or of the activity of the soul, which is the provisional definition of that end, also called by the name of happiness.

What we have found is that the simplest act of social duty taught by habituation to the growing citizen, say courage or soberness, has in it a motive, or we may say really implies an awakening and a yearning of the soul, which first expresses itself in loyalty to society and in good citizenship, but which can find no final satisfaction till it completes itself in the knowledge and thought of God, in union with whom alone the individual comes to be that which he really is.

5. How, we may ask, can these ideas be translated into characteristics of any actual society? Are we to draw a picture of a social life sharply divided between pleasure and industry on the one hand and a monastic quietism on the other? Or again, are we to think of a futile and pedantic effort to make philosophy and theology the common occupation of men, in place of the healthy activities of living? What the Greek idea of the social mind suggests to us is neither of these things.

We have to remember that the social mind is to be thought of as a single spirit, though pouring itself into different channels according to the differences involved

in social organization. The form of the individual soul is perfected in this way. The importance of this is that every individual mind, while attending especially to its private functions, is at the same time a microcosm which lends to, and borrows from, every other mind, or factor of the social spirit. The ruler learns from the workman, the scholar from the soldier, just as the workman is guided by the ruler, or the soldier can only apply himself rightly to his profession by borrowing the spirit of the scholar. What Aristotle wishes, then, is to see states so organized that the lamp of religion and fine art and high thinking may always be kept burning, and that this fact may have its fair and proper influence on the spirit and ideals of the people as a whole. "I assume," says Miss Kingsley, in one of her delightful books on West African experiences, "that the whole desire of every man is to know God." This is one of those sayings that fill us with delight. But it is, of course, a matter of implication and not of conscious wish. Yet it illustrates the point that all persons are capable of religion and knowledge, and that the tone and worthiness of their life is very different according as they are or are not, in their degree, conscious of an inspiration and an ideal pervading their society. The servant who sweeps a minister's study, having respect for his office, shares in his spiritual work, and is the better even for that amount of sharing in it. The minister, of course, as Plato's "Republic" should imply to us, has also to learn from the servant. We have to think of the tone of a society in which saintliness and intelligence and science or, again, fine art and poetry are respected, compared with one in which all things of that kind go to the wall. The two are different, not merely in including a few individuals of different types, but in the whole mind and spirit of every person, right down to the simplest and the least fortunate citizens. The contrast of Scotland and probably Wales with some other countries might illustrate what is meant. Or take, with all their defects, the case of Athens under

Pericles, or of Geneva under Calvin. Such societies are the salt of the earth. That is a general example of what Aristotle meant, as we can see to-day; though it is possible that local and national feeling and a severe political judgment prevented him from entertaining an unmingled respect for the Athens which we admire.

6. How is this glorification of *theoria* to be reconciled with what we take to be the needs of practical life, and the necessity that education should prepare us for it? In the first place, let us understand distinctly of what we are speaking. *Theoria* for a Greek is not what we mean by theory; and the theoretic life is not what we call a theoretical pursuit. Theory for us comes near to an intellectual fiction; a way of grasping and comprehending a complex of observations. *Theoria* for a Greek meant the vision of what is most real; the mind of one who sees life steadily and sees it whole. Theoretical considerations for us mean mostly what is abstract and hypothetical; "if this change, then that consequence." Theoretic life for the Greek meant the life of insight, a man's hold and grasp of the central realities of what is most valuable and most divine, and therefore also most human.

I have ventured to suggest elsewhere that not only in conception, but in actual fact there is no inconsistency between the theoretic activity thus understood and the most practical activities in the ordinary sense of the term. Is it not a striking thing apart from all satire and from all jesting that among the world's leaders of business activity we should always find the Jew, the Quaker and the Scotsman? Is not, perhaps, a certain security and sagacity of judgment conferred by a habit of mind in which everything is referred to a center, and which is capable of a superior view permitting the details of life to drop into a subordinate place?

But as to the idea of *theoria* in the sense we have spoken of, in connection with the practical aim of life, we may hear Aristotle himself. "The practical life need not, as

some think, be a life of action toward others; nor are those thoughts alone practical which are cherished for the sake of the results of the action. The name practical belongs much more truly to the thoughts of intrinsic value, thoughts which are ends in themselves; for to attain the end is necessarily a kind of action, and even in external action we give the title of agent *par excellence* to those to whom the constructive thought belongs.”

7. There are three kindred ideas which for Aristotle express attainment of the end of human life: Theoretical Wisdom, Leisure, Happiness. (It is interesting that so strict is Aristotle in affirming his idea of happiness as the fullness of human life and capacity that he denies it to the child, as to the brute creation.) Leisure is especially to be distinguished from recreation and amusement. Both are alike, in that they appear to be chosen for their own sake only, but it is only an appearance. Recreation and amusement are in truth means, not ends. Their value is to make work possible, not in any worth of their own. Leisure is different; it is the expression or condition of the attainment of the end; or, as we might say, it is the satisfaction of a disinterested interest. We all know that ‘school’=‘leisure’; to have leisure for a thing means to devote yourself to it as an interest. So much in earnest is Aristotle with this distinction that he modifies Plato’s judgment upon music with a view to it, and says that the laborer must be allowed his music, oddly enough of an elaborate and artificial type, by way of amusement and recreation; while the educated man will require for the right use of leisure his own music of a more classical kind. And the main object of education is to teach the right use of leisure; the devotion of the mind to what it feels to fill its need.

All this comes to saying that the object of education for Aristotle was to communicate disinterested interests. But perhaps nothing could, to-day, be more practical or of a higher social importance. What could be more practical than to rescue some large proportion of the one hun-

dred and sixty million pounds that in this country go every year in drink? And was not Dr. Johnson fundamentally right when he said, "Sir, the reason why a man drinks is that he is not interesting enough to himself to pass his leisure time without it"?

As we have seen, it is an error to suppose that these interests are only for a cloistered caste, distinct and divided from society at large. They are implied in and permeate all social life and are its quintessence. They are not artificial, or imposed upon the social whole *ab extra*, but spring out of its nature. Take the mere phrase, 'Learning to read.' How many meanings it may bear! I remember a severe critic once observing that our circulating libraries act as middlemen between writers who do not know how to write and readers who do not know how to read. What a thing it would be if the children who pass through our schools had 'learned *to read*,' in the sense in which the critic meant that our novel-reading public had not. To read, that is, for their own enjoyment, things worth reading. Grant, if we like, that Aristotle throws his *desideratum* too much into the form of philosophy and theology. Both of these exist, and Aristotle knew it well, in the more accessible forms of poetry and religion. And these at least are universal possessions, and no class in a modern state need be excluded from participating through them in the supreme spiritual activity.

LONDON.

B. BOSANQUET.

CHARITY ORGANIZATION.

THOMAS JONES.

DR. BOSANQUET does not "at all recognize the portrait of the Charity Organization movement in its relation to the Poor Law" which I outlined in the January (1910) number of the JOURNAL. It was not my purpose to draw a full-length portrait of the C. O. S., still